

make sure that they have access to this fund for which it was created and not have to go to courts to have class action lawsuits. And that is what we are working on with the other body and the majority leader in the other body to get done.

I want to read just a couple of letters that come from these people who have no place to turn. Here is a letter that came from a Marcy Kelly from Mullica Hill, New Jersey, and she writes:

"My son turned 4 in October, 2002, and was diagnosed with autism after a long history of medical problems that began at 2 months, within 1 week of his first series of thimerosal-containing vaccines. His immune system, weakened to where he couldn't handle viruses (resulting in recurring ear infections and RSV), he had reflux, terrible allergies and eczema, and a reaction to his MMR shot that is documented to have caused vomiting nightly for 6 months post vaccination and 2 years of diarrhea. Medical tests show toxic levels of metals, reduced glutathione, malabsorption, maldigestion, severe allergies, and liver problems, all common in those poisoned by mercury. He regressed into autism between 18 and 24 months." As a father and grandfather, you understand the heartbreak that I felt.

This is a picture of him.

"We have spent well over \$100,000 in the last 2 years, mostly on medical visits, tests, and therapies. Our insurance company, Aetna US Healthcare, stopped paying for these funds." So they have noplacement to go.

And she ends up by saying, "I understand that you intend to take our stories before Congress, not individually but as a group. If you could take a single child (or family with more than one child on the spectrum) and pile up all of the medical and therapy bills, ADA drill books and materials, and supplements used to help them heal from the effects of vaccines, it would be quite mountainous and tell a story as well. God be with you and with other politicians as they vote on matters relating to autism. In the quiet of night, if politicians would ask themselves the question 'what is right?' the answer in their hearts would be to help their children and their families."

We have the ability to do that, and we must do something and we must do it very soon, because these families are suffering; and we have to be very diligent to make sure the other body does not put some language in the bill that would be like what was in the homeland security bill which protected pharmaceutical companies but not the children.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so very much. I caught his presentation on the screen as I was going through the cloakroom, and I cannot tell him how proud I am of him for dealing with this issue of autism and children. I commend him for his in-

terest. I commend him for the work that he is doing on it.

I came in close contact with children who were autistic when I started in the Head Start program.

□ 1815

Prior to the Head Start program, we had children who were autistic and had other kinds of deficiencies that never got discovered, and that is one reason I love the Head Start program so very, very much. But the most interesting and the most challenging and the most untold story was the story of children with autism.

I join the gentleman in his efforts and will do everything that I can to bring attention and resources to help these families of children who have autism.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we will contact the gentlewoman on that legislation. We will be down here every night that is available to talk about this issue. I thank the gentlewoman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) laid before the House the following communication from NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
April 8, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to (40 U.S.C. 188a), I hereby appoint Rep. Chaka Fattah as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission for the 108th Congress.
Best Regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

WILL WE WIN THE PEACE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, due to the bravery and the magnificent performance of American troops, our Armed Forces will soon win a resounding victory over Saddam Hussein, disarming him and eliminating the threat of his regime. Now that we are on the verge of winning the war, we must now turn our attention to winning the peace.

The morning after our military victory over Saddam, we will wake up to four challenges in Iraq: peacekeeping, humanitarian relief, reconstruction, and governance. How we face those challenges will determine whether we win the peace, win the battle for the hearts and minds of the people of Iraq, enhance our status in the Muslim world, and maintain our credibility as the leader of free and democratic nations.

I fear we could fail to meet those challenges if we pursue an aggressive,

antagonistic diplomacy that makes demands of our allies, but does not listen to them. We could fail if we embrace unilateralism and abandon our traditional reliance on multinational action. We could fail if we allow the reality or even the appearance of an American military colonial government in Iraq.

To meet these challenges and best serve American national interests, as well as the best interests of the citizens of Iraq, I suggest eight steps:

First, the State Department, not the Defense Department, must be in charge of American policy after the military victory.

Second, whenever and wherever possible, we must internationalize the stabilization and reconstruction operations and not try to do it all ourselves.

Third, American troops in the field will be needed to keep the peace, but we should move quickly to spread the burden of peacekeeping by giving NATO the task. NATO is a robust military alliance that defeated one tyrant in Kosovo and surely could keep order in a post-Saddam Iraq.

Fourth, emergency relief authority must begin with the State Department and USAID, but there is no better chief administrator for the humanitarian challenges than the United Nations. Its vast resources, experience and expertise are unparalleled.

Fifth, we must engage expert multilateral organizations like the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank in the reconstruction of Iraq's infrastructure. A debt restructuring is needed to deal with Iraq's financial burden of \$383 billion including foreign debt, compensation claims, and pending contracts.

Sixth, we should convene a donor's conference soon after the military victory. Funds will be needed right away for quick start reconstruction projects. This could provide a funding opportunity for the Arab League.

Seventh, Iraqis must establish corruption-free control over their own oil. We should advocate for a transparent and reformed industry that accounts for oil revenues and devotes profits to rebuilding the country.

Eighth, we should urge the United Nations to sponsor a conference on the formation and direction of a transitional Iraqi-based government. Iraqi provisional leaders, internal Saddam opponents, exiles and the international community should be brought together to establish a stable representative government of Iraqis.

We must seize this opportunity to stabilize and unify Iraq and demonstrate to the entire world our commitment to democratic values, personal liberties, and social justice. That is how we win the peace in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REDUCING THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I came to the well of the House, and I said that the FDA had declared war on American consumers. Now the battle is joined.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a brochure, a little brochure that my staff and I have put together. On the cover it says, "If we want to allow Americans to keep and spend over \$600 billion during the next 10 years, here is a good place to start." Then at the bottom you have a picture of some pharmaceutical capsules.

Then if you open the brochure, the second page says, "That is right. According to the CBO," that is congressional language for the Congressional Budget Office, they are our official bean counters, "According to the CBO, American seniors will spend over \$1.8 trillion." By "seniors" they mean only those people who are 65 years of age or older. So over the next 10 years, the CBO tells us that seniors alone will spend over \$1.8 trillion on prescription drugs.

Now, a conservative estimate, not done by me, but by experts who are a whole lot smarter than I am, a conservative estimate would be that we can save 35 percent by allowing free markets to work. Again, I am not particularly good at math, but 35 percent times \$1.8 trillion works out to \$630 billion.

Here we have a chart. This is the latest chart. I have actually had in the last 4 years four different charts. I do not use my own numbers, although we have actually done our own research to confirm that these are very accurate in terms of the average prices that Americans pay, and these are some of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States.

Let us start right at the top, a drug called Augmentin. Here in the United States, according to the Life Extension Foundation that has been doing research on this for more than a decade, the average price for a 30-day supply in the United States is \$55.50. That same drug sells in Canada for about \$12, and it sells in Europe for an average price of only \$8.75. There are differences in the value of currency, but the net ef-

fect is that Americans pay that much more for the same drug.

Look at another drug, a drug made by a German company called Bayer. We usually call it Bayer, Bayer Aspirin. Cipro became real popular last year when we had anthrax here in these buildings, because it is one of the most effective drugs for things like anthrax. But Cipro in the United States sells for an average of \$87.99 for a month's supply. In Canada it sells for \$55.53 cents, and in Europe, in Germany, where they make it, they sell it for \$40.75.

The list goes on. Let me talk about a drug called Coumadin. My 85-year-old father takes Coumadin. Fortunately, because he worked for a union all of his life, worked as a union worker all of his life, under his contract he has prescription drug coverage, so it does not cost him \$64.88, which is what it costs the average American consumer in the United States if they do not have prescription drug coverage; \$64.88 in the United States, \$24.94 in Canada, and only \$15.80 in Europe.

The list goes on. This is reflective, and it goes on and on and on.

Down here, I put a famous quote by one of my favorite Presidents, President Ronald Reagan. He said, "Markets are more powerful than armies." At the end of the day, you cannot hold markets back; but unfortunately, that is what is happening in the United States.

Now, I have no qualms with the big pharmaceutical industry in the sense that they ought to be able to sell their drugs for what they want to sell them for. But they should not be allowed to hide behind the FDA to do it. So I do not say shame on them as much as I say shame on us. It is we the Congress, we the policymakers here in the United States that have allowed these disparities to happen.

Finally, we are having a big debate right now about tax cuts, how much should we give in tax cuts. Is it going to be \$625 billion or \$535 billion or \$375 billion?

Tax cuts are great, particularly at a time when the economy is soft. But if we really want to help seniors, if we want to lower prescription drug prices and allow Americans to keep and spend \$630 billion of their money over the next 10 years, let us open markets now.

Finally, it just says simply Americans deserve world-class drugs at world-class prices. All we are asking for is open markets. All we want is what German pharmacists have the right to do, and that is buy drugs where they can get them the cheapest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to one of my heroes. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) held a hearing last week, and it was one of the best hearings I have ever participated in.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman covered the issue very well.

I just wanted to make one comment, and that is that some of the pharmaceutical companies, like SmithKline of

England, are going into Canada and saying if you sell pharmaceutical drugs in the United States for the price that you are paying in Canada, which is about one-fourth or one-half of what they are here, we are going to cut you off. They are doing that in a bullying way.

I do not think pharmaceutical companies should say to a country, you cannot sell those drugs in the United States because it is the same product that in America we are paying two or three times for it. It makes no sense to me.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely right. What is being done by some of the big pharmaceutical companies is nothing short of shameful. I also say shame on us.

I said the other day that Teddy Roosevelt must be rolling in his grave, the Republican President who believed in breaking up the trusts, in enforcing competition, because he understood, as President Reagan understood, that markets are more powerful than armies.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to live up to its responsibilities. It is time for Congress to allow Americans to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1036

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1036.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

WINNING THE ECONOMIC WAR AT HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there are two major stories in the news. There is one that we see daily, and that is the story of the war in Iraq. The other story we hear little about, and that is the economic war right here at home.

Last month the Pentagon announced we will be sending another 100,000 troops to Iraq, and our hearts are with them. They are putting their lives at risk for us. They deserve our support. But last week the Associated Press reported that an even greater number of people, 108,000, lost their jobs, as U.S. companies dealt with the battered economy right here at home. These Americans also work every day to support the ideals of our Nation and the work ethic. They deserve our support.

It is also ironic to note that prior to the Pentagon's recent deployment, there were already 300,000 troops in the vicinity of Iraq. In February, according to the Associated Press, businesses here at home shed almost as many